

Approved For Release 2000/06/06 : CIA-RDP81-00261R000700030097-0

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY OTR-9276

16 NOV 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Management and Services

SUBJECT : DD/M&S Control of M&S Positions and Personnel

REFERENCE : Memo dtd 15 Oct 73 to DD/M&S fm MSAG, same subject

1. This responds to your request of 2 November 1973 for comments on the Management and Services Advisory Group (MSAG) recommendation that DD/M&S seek "control authority for all M&S positions and personnel."

2. Only four positions carrying the "MI" designation are located in other Components (all four are in NPIC), so OTR has little direct involvement at present with the issue posed by MSAG. Nevertheless, we have a long-standing concern with the general subject and have followed it with keen interest, particularly during the period in 1967-68 when DD/S and DD/P were trying to negotiate a number of adjustments in career designations of positions in their respective Directorates. Included in these negotiations was the proposal (which DD/P did not accept) that the bulk of OTR's Ops Instructor positions carry a "D" designation.

3. None of our considerations of this issue, however, in 1967-68 or since, has included the suggestion that our Directorate ought to have "primary control" - i.e., ceiling control - of the positions involved. We haven't thought this necessary or desirable. And we fail to follow the logic of MSAG's contention that lack of ceiling control is "inequitable and significantly limits the DD/M&S in effectively accomplishing long-range planning of Directorate personnel resources."

4. Under the present system, DD/M&S does know his personnel commitments to other Directorates and thus can plan the intake, development, and management of his careerists. Any change in those commitments must be coordinated with him and differences of view are negotiated on a reasonable and equitable basis. If Saigon, for example, is required to take a ceiling cut, its impact on the Support elements of the station is carefully evaluated and a decision reached, first at the station in full coordination with the

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

Support Chief there, then in similar manner with the Support Chief of EA Division, with the Heads of the DD/M&S Offices affected, and finally with the DD/M&S.

5. We think it is illusory to believe that a different result would be achieved if DD/M&S had "primary control" of the Support slots in Saigon and thus could frustrate or override the judgements reached at the successive levels involved - and in which senior Support Officers have a very influential, if not decisive, voice. Indeed, we would be rather worried if that were possible (and we assume the point of MSAG's recommendation is that it should be possible) because it would very likely, and perhaps quickly, undermine the cordial relationships that have long existed between DD/M&S and the other Directorates. Also, Support Officers serving with other Directorates might be cast in the role of outsiders, whereas they are now accepted as full-fledged members of the management team of their Components.

6. In short, we think DD/M&S now has the tools needed for long-range planning and development of his careerists, and we counsel against seeking ceiling control of Support positions in other Directorates.



Acting Director of Training

STATINTL